

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Sonoma State University

Professional Services Division

April 2012

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Sonoma State University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation** is made for the institution.

Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions For all Programs offered by the Institution

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	X		
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	X		
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	X		
4) Diversity	X		
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	X		
6) Unit Governance and Resources	X		
CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process	X		
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	X		

Program Standards

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject	19	19		
Single Subject with Internship	19	19		
Preliminary Education Specialist	16	16*		
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate	6	6*		
Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe	8	8*		
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder	3	3*		
Added Authorization: Adaptive Physical Education	4	4*		
Reading Certificate	11	11*		

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Reading /Language Arts Specialist	20	20*		
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	15		
Professional Administrative Services	9	9		
Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling	32	32		

* The site team has made a finding of all standards Met, using the sampling process of onsite interviews and document review. For each of these programs, a standard by standard document will be reviewed through program assessment one year after transitioning. This process will complete the program review and accreditation process for these programs.

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: Sonoma State University

Dates of Visit: March 4-6, 2012

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The entire team reviewed each of the six NCATE/Common Standards and determined whether the standard was met, not met, or met with concerns. The site visit team found that all NCATE/Common Standards are **Met**.

Program Standards

Individual team members and the total team membership discussed findings and provided appropriate input regarding the programs at Sonoma State University. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The CTC team found that all standards are **Met** in all programs.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documents and program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, master teachers, candidates, completers, and Advisory Board members. Based on NCATE/Common and program standards findings the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject

Single Subject

Single Subject Intern

Preliminary Education Specialist

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Mild/Moderate Disabilities Intern

Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Moderate/Severe Disabilities Intern

Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum

Disorders – New program

Added Authorization: Adaptive PE

Advanced/Service Credentials

Reading Certificate

Reading and Language Arts Specialist

Administrative Services

Preliminary

Professional

Pupil Personnel Services

School Counseling

School Counseling Intern

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Sonoma State University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Sonoma State University continues in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team
Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team

NCATE Co-Chair	Gerard R. Giordano University of North Florida
California Co-Chair:	Cynthia Grutzik CSU Dominguez Hills
NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:	Elaine Francis Fitchburg State University, MA
	Theresa R. DiPasquale Classroom Teacher, Buffalo, NY
	Mary Kay Finan Frostburg State University, Maryland
	James Richmond California State University, Chico
	Cathy Buell San Jose State University
Programs Cluster:	Anne Weisenberg CSU Stanislaus
	Buck Weber El Tejon USD
	Nancy Bernstein CSU Northridge
	Ray Vincent Los Angeles County Office of Education
Staff to the Accreditation Team	Terry Janicki , Administrator Paula Jacobs , Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog	Fieldwork Handbooks
Course Syllabi	Advisement Documents
Candidate Files	Faculty Vitae
Follow-up Survey Results	Program Assessment Preliminary Report of Findings
Program Assessment Feedback	College Budget Plan
Biennial Report Feedback	PACT Data
Field Experience Notebooks	Student Handbooks
Schedule of Classes	Meeting minutes
Flowcharts of Program Requirements	Assessment Protocol
Assessment Data	Biennial Reports

Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards Cluster	Program Sampling Cluster	TOTAL
Candidates	123	98	221
Completers	11	38	49
Employers	14	35	49
Institutional Administration	6	6	12
Program Coordinators	9	9	18
Faculty/Adjunct	72	52	124
TPA Coordinator	2	1	3
Field Supervisors – Program	28	28	56
Field Supervisors - District	23	23	46
Credential Analysts and Staff	15	8	23
Advisory Board Members	53 total attended	10	63
Other	3	0	3
Totals	359	308	667

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of program completers (2010-11) ^a	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2011-12) ^b	Agency Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject	101	156	CTC
Multiple Subject, with Intern	0	0	CTC
Single Subject	72	123	CTC
Single Subject, with Intern	6	2	CTC
Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Disabilities	0	33	CTC
Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Disabilities, with Intern	0	9	CTC
Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Moderate/Severe Disabilities	0	15	CTC
Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Moderate/Severe Disabilities, with Intern	0	5	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I and Level 2: Mild/Moderate Disabilities	38	14	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I and Level 2: Mild/Moderate Disabilities, with Intern	12	1	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I and Level 2: Moderate/Severe Disabilities	7	5	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I and Level 2: Moderate/Severe Disabilities, with Intern	0	1	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	12	15	CCREP/CTC
Adaptive Physical Education	1	7	CTC
Preliminary Administrative Services	13	4	CTC
Preliminary Administrative Services, with Intern	3	3	CTC
Professional Administrative Services	8	1	
Reading Certificate	2	5	CTC
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential	5	6	CTC

The Visit

The Sonoma State University site visit was held on the campus in Rohnert Park, California from March 4-6, 2012. This was a joint NCATE/CTC accreditation visit, piloting the Continuing Improvement model for NCATE. The site visit team consisted of a Team Lead, two California BIR members who served on the NCATE team reviewing the NCATE Unit Standards (Common Standards), and, because of the size and number of programs and pathways, four Program Standards members. Two Commission consultants accompanied the site team. The NCATE team and the California state team arrived at the hotel on Saturday evening, March 3, 2012. The teams met jointly Sunday morning, and on Sunday afternoon arrived at SSU where the dean provided an orientation to the Institution, the School of Education and its programs. Sunday

evening a reception was held at the new Green Music Center where the accreditation team and participants were greeted by the IHE leadership including the president and provost. The dean of the School of Education provided a warm welcome and an orientation to the School of Education, the accreditation visit and the new music center. The reception included poster sessions by each of the programs and interviews with constituents. Interviews continued through Monday with administration, faculty, staff and constituencies. A mid-visit report was shared with the dean and accreditation coordinator Monday afternoon. The exit report was conducted at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 6, 2012.

Board of Examiners Report for Continuous Improvement Pilot Visit
Institution: Sonoma State University

Team Recommendations:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	M	M
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	M	M
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	M	M
4. Diversity	M	M
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	M	M
6. Unit Governance and Resources	M	M

1.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Sonoma State University, one of the 23 campuses of the California State University system, is a relatively young institution. Sonoma State University is celebrating the 50th anniversary of its founding. It began in 1956 as a satellite of San Francisco State University, with a small facility in nearby Santa Rosa. One of its primary purposes at that time was to offer teacher education courses and programs to residents of the North Bay counties: Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Mendocino, Lake and Solano. In 1961, Sonoma State College officially opened its doors at a temporary facility in Rohnert Park, with an enrollment of 265 students. The college began with baccalaureate degrees, teaching credentials and selected masters degrees. Sonoma State College moved to its present 274-acre Rohnert Park site in 1966 when its first two buildings, Stevenson and Darwin Halls, were completed. By then there were more than 1,000 students enrolled. In 1978, University status was granted and the name of the institution was changed to Sonoma State University. Built on the site of a former seed farm, the campus today has a beautiful park landscape that is widely acclaimed. Yet, while the “face” of the university has changed significantly in many ways, the heart of the institution has remained constant. Sonoma State University has always been student-focused and committed to the highest standards in teaching.

The quality of SSU students and graduates and the investment of the community in this institution are clear evidence of the success of Sonoma State University. Today the campus has an enrollment of approximately 8,000 students, 86% of whom are undergraduates. With 40% of the student body living on campus, Sonoma State University is one of the most residential campuses in the CSU system. Sonoma State University offers 45 bachelor degree programs, 16 master’s degree programs, a doctorate in education, and eleven programs that offer credentials, certificates, or added authorizations.

Sonoma State University's School of Education began as the Department of Education in the School of Social Sciences. In 1984-85 it was approved by the President and the Academic Senate to be a free-standing School. From its inception until 2000-01, the School of Education was organized as one department and school. In 2000-01 it reorganized into four departments, and in 2001-02 consolidated two departments into one, leaving the current organization of three departments: Curriculum Studies and Secondary Education (CSEE), Educational Leadership and Special Education (ELSE), and Literacy, Elementary, and Early Elementary Education (LEEE). Each department houses one basic credential program and at least one Education M.A. program concentration.

The School of Education is comprised eleven programs that offer credentials, certificates, or added authorizations. These programs include a Preliminary Multiple Subject, a Preliminary Single Subject, a Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities, and Moderate/Severe Disabilities, Added Authorizations in Autism Spectrum Disorders and Adaptive Physical Education, and the Administrative Services credential programs (Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services – PASC I & II) and the Graduate Reading programs (Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential). The Unit also includes the Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Counseling, the Adapted Physical Education credential and the Master of Education degree.

- The Multiple Subject Credential program prepares approximately 150 post baccalaureate candidates annually. Applicants are admitted in both fall and spring semesters. The Multiple Subject credential entitles bearers to teach all subjects in self-contained classrooms grades PreK-12.
- The Single Subject Credential program prepares approximately 80 post baccalaureate candidates annually. Applicants are admitted in both fall and spring semesters. The Single Subject credential authorizes the holder to teach a particular subject (e.g., history, science, English) to students in any grade PreK-12.
- The Education Specialist Credential programs (Mild/Moderate & Moderate/Severe) prepares approximately 45 post baccalaureate candidates annually. Applicants are admitted in both fall and spring semesters.
- The Adapted Physical Education Credential program is housed in the School of Science and Technology and prepares approximately 5-10 candidates per year. Applicants are admitted in both fall and spring semesters.
- The Administrative Services Credential (PASC I & II) prepares approximately 25 post baccalaureate candidates annually. Applicants are admitted in the fall semester only.
- The Reading Certificate and Credential programs prepare approximately 12 post baccalaureate candidates annually. Applicants are admitted in both fall and spring semesters.
- The Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential is housed in the School of Social Sciences and prepares approximately 10-15 post baccalaureate candidates annually. Applicants are admitted in the fall semester only.
- The Master of Arts Degree in Education with concentrations in six areas: Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning, Early Childhood Education, Educational Leadership, Reading and Language, Special Education, and TESOL prepares approximately 50 post baccalaureate candidates annually. Applicants are admitted in both fall and spring semesters.

Programs meet within departments, twice a semester in school-wide meetings, at the biennial Assessment Colloquium and in integrated program meetings. The Council of Chairs oversees the interactions of programs. For example the coordination of courses, faculty, resources, assessment review, program and unit evaluation, and faculty oversight are coordinated by faculty committees and the Council of Chairs and Dean.

The School of Education's relationship to other Schools at SSU is one of equal standing. The Division of Academic Affairs apportions funds to the School of Education in a fashion that is equal to the other schools. The school is allotted monies to cover the salaries of permanent staff and tenure track faculty. The school is given an enrollment target set as a number of Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Using the enrollment target, a Student: Faculty Ratio (SFR; usually the CSU average for Schools of Education) and the number of full time permanent faculty, the University estimates the amount of money needed to fund any courses with part-time faculty that cannot be covered by permanent faculty. Moreover, the University supports the School's larger operating expenses due to the admissions and credentialing tasks that the School of Education has that other Schools do not. The School of Education has a line item budget that is dedicated to accreditation, including the cost of the assessment system and particularly the cost of maintaining the TPA. While the funds for supporting the School of Education are apportioned in an equitable fashion to the other schools, the current financial crisis has led to severe cuts in additional monies for advising, higher SFRs and large class sizes.

1.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit. Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This visit was conducted as a merged, continuing visit with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). The visit was conducted under the NCATE Continuous Improvement Pilot protocol with Standard One being identified as the target standard. The state chair and consultants from the CTC assisted the NCATE BOE with the visit and provided consultation regarding state program approval policies and processes.

The initial activity of the pilot process consisted of the review of the Institutional Report (IR) followed by an offsite review conducted by a conference call. This culminated in the preparation of an Offsite BOE Feedback Report. Three NCATE BOE members and two state team members appointed to the BOE team conducted the offsite review in November of 2011 in consultation with the state team chair, representatives from the CTC and the NCATE senior vice president. The Offsite Feedback Report was completed and submitted to the institution in preparation for the onsite visit.

A previsit was conducted in person in January 2012. During the previsit, discussion focused on identification of the state protocol, clarification of IR contents, review of an addendum to the IR, discussion of additional artifacts prepared by the institution in response to the Offsite BOE Report, individuals to include in onsite interviews, roles of NCATE and state teams, and logistical plans for the onsite visit.

In California, institutions submit programs for review to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). State and NCATE teams shared information and workrooms, jointly attended interviews, and functioned as a single team as appropriate. Two state team members were NCATE-appointed team members resulting in an NCATE team size of six.

The institution solicited third party input. No responses were received.

1.4 Describe any unusual circumstances that affected the visit.

No special circumstances affected this visit.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework established the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

The SSU conceptual framework was formed by multiple constituents, including teachers, school administrators, personnel within the unit, and personnel throughout the university. It rests on the conviction that candidates have the ability to promote social justice. It also rests on the conviction that they can enable children, adolescents, and adults to construct knowledge through active inquiry and exploration. It embraces pedagogy, assessment, curriculum, research, technology, collaboration, multiculturalism, performance expectations, and professional dispositions

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Overall Findings

Candidates demonstrate depth of knowledge and pedagogical skills. All programs within the unit follow the PEARL assessment system (Pursuing Excellence through Assessment, Reflection and Learning). PEARL incorporates assessments at specific transition points. Candidates are aware of clearly defined transition points at admission to a program, prior to clinical experiences, during clinical experiences, at program completion, and following certification.

The initial and advanced credential programs meet California standards. In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of precise admission criteria and explicitly documented procedures. The unit ensures that candidates have appropriate experiences and personal characteristics that include sensitivity to diverse populations, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and strong potential to become an effective professional.

1.2 Continuous Improvement

Candidates from initial and advanced programs ensure that students learn. For example, the elementary and secondary candidates assemble ample evidence that they are able to identify and evaluate their impact on student learning using the PACT assessment system. This evidence is reviewed and assessed by unit faculty. Faculty and administrators identified multiple instances in which the reviews and assessments have led to substantive program modifications. These are presented in the Biennial Reports.

The unit maintains an assessment system for advanced programs that is comparable to that of the initial programs. Candidates who are preparing to serve as other school professionals also have assessments that complement those in the initial programs. For example, Administrative services candidates reflect on the ways that their future decisions may influence student learning. The data from the school counseling practicum convincingly indicates that candidates have had an more than adequate influence on their candidates.

Each program assesses the professional dispositions of candidates. The assessments include candidate interviews, portfolio assessments, performance assessments, evaluation of clinical experiences, and samples of candidate work. Candidate interviews consistently reveal that candidates interact effectively with students, families, peers, community personnel, and their unit supervisors. They also provide evidence that the candidates interact effectively with the personnel in professional organizations and with staff in the Student Services office.

1.3 Movement to the Target Level

The unit has demonstrated exemplary standards and remarkable achievements in multiple areas. The achievements are substantiated by numerous exhibits and within many interviews. They are evident in the ways that the unit makes assessments, defines transition points, employs admission criteria, and defines the professional dispositions of its candidates. The candidates participate in an impressive system in which they, themselves assess the impact that they have on student learning.

The unit's standards and achievements are evident in the pass rates that Multiple and Single Subjects candidates get on California's Reading Instruction Competency Assessment exam. Their aggregate pass rates were 99 percent from 2005—2007. The pass rate was 98 percent in 2008 and 93 percent in 2009.

1.4 Strengths

- Teacher candidates develop highly creative learning activities, implement them, and then gather data about their impact on student learning.
- Teacher candidates reflect on the pedagogy that they employ and identify the ways in which that pedagogy aligns with state standards.
- The candidates in all programs provide evidence that they display professional dispositions while interacting with students and their families.
- A commitment to social justice is a critical feature of the unit's conceptual framework. This feature permeates every aspect of the programs. Candidates provided eloquent testimonials about their personal wishes to make genuine changes within classrooms, communities, and the world.

1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Finding: Met

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Overall Findings

Sonoma State University's School of Education (SOE) has developed, uses, and consistently upgrades assessment processes that result in an effective, comprehensive assessment system for the institution's preparation programs. There are on-going refinements being made to the unit's assessment system. This is to be expected as the institution operates in a continuous improvement mode.

The system, identified as Pursuing Excellence through Assessment, Reflection, and Learning (PEARL), provides data to be collected and analyzed at a number of key transition points as well as follow-up information for those who become employed in their chosen area of study (i.e. elementary teaching, special education, administration, etc.). The system is tied to the SOE conceptual framework, based on collecting data from multiple measures, and is implemented in a manner that obtains fair, non-biased data. The system is responsive to both state and national data collection requirements.

The assessment system is examined regularly and revised as needed. This process of updating the assessment processes is, in general, the purview the Assessment and Accreditation Committee and includes questions and suggestions from the unit's Council of Chairs. This system is described in the Institutional Report (IR) and the Biennial Report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC).

California credential program standards for Multiple Subject (MS) and Single Subject (SS) and Special Education (Education Specialist [ES]) require that candidates demonstrate knowledge of subject matter before program entry and capacity in basic skill areas (reading, writing, mathematics) before being recommended for a credential. In addition to these requirements, Sonoma State University's assessment system provides evidence of data collection and analysis of key assessments (detailed in the Biennial Report to the CTC) for multiple years and indicates levels of candidate proficiency in areas of content knowledge, teaching skill, and dispositions.

Before being recommended for a teaching credential in California, MS and SS candidates must demonstrate proficiency in all 13 areas of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) defined by CTC standards. Sonoma State has selected the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) system, a state approved assessment, to provide evidence of teaching proficiency in Multiple and Single Subjects. The institution provides evidence of candidate performance on this measure, including passing rates for candidates. Other program areas have developed and use specific means to assess candidate competence. Some programs use overall course performance (course grades) that is based on candidate response to tasks and judged by a rubric scoring system.

Other programs use specific key assignments, again scored by rubrics, to judge candidate competence. All program areas have some specific means to determine that candidates are meeting required levels of competence.

Across the unit's programs, data are collected for program entry; transition points during the program, program completion, and follow-up after completers enter the field of professional practice.

All PACT assessors must be trained and certified before they can participate in the assessment process. Important aspects of the training require the assessor judgments to be unbiased, fair, accurate, and consistent. Other program areas are in various stages of having a process in place to assure consistency across assessors and continuity between program expectations and multiple measures used to assess candidates.

From evidence found in the IR as well as the Biennial Reports, it is clear that the system used by the unit does differentiate acceptable from unacceptable levels of candidate performance. There are examples cited of candidates not initially passing assessments, being able to acquire additional skill, and then retaking assessments. Generally, retakes result in passage, but there are reported instances where, if unsuccessful on retake, candidates are either not recommended to proceed in a program or simply elect to discontinue their involvement in the program. Before being recommended for and receiving a credential, all candidates must meet the standards of teaching competence required in both content knowledge and teaching skill.

There is documentation that the PEARL assessment system, in its design and implementation, uses multiple measures and addresses the TPEs as well as the knowledge, skills, and dispositions (KSD) defined by NCATE standards. The appropriate aspects of the TPE and KSD are assessed at key transition points including admission to programs, entry into clinical practice, exit from clinical practice, and program completion. In relation to the MS, SS, and ES programs, the institution also uses a California State University system-wide assessment tool to determine the degree to which one-year teachers and their employers rate the preparation by their programs to be effective in the classroom.

The Biennial Report to the CTC presents the comprehensive set of data related to candidate admission, progress in programs, and competence of candidates prior to recommendation. There are also data presented in this report that provide information about perceived program quality from completers as well as their supervisors. The data obtained for the Biennial Report is regularly and systematically collected and reported.

There is a well described multiple level system (from unit through institution) for dealing with candidate concerns and for defining ways to resolve concerns.

Primarily based on the information provided to the CTC in the 2011 Biennial Report, it appears the unit is using data regularly and systematically to examine the effectiveness of program elements and candidate performance in relation to standards. Further, there is evidence presented that, to a degree, the institution uses outcomes from assessment processes for purposes of program improvement. In general, the assessment process, the utilization of data, and the decisions about program improvement are a joint conversation of faculty, unit leadership, and field-based partners.

2.2 Continuous Improvement:

There is considerable evidence that the institution is invested substantially in assessment efforts to assure candidates are competent in relation to state and national standards. There is also evidence that the unit is making considerable effort to continuously improve the assessment system in order to provide for even more effective unit evaluation. Minutes of meetings clearly indicate the Assessment and Accreditation Committee (AAC), guided in part by suggestions from the Council of Chairs, has considered what will improve the assessment system and is moving toward implementation of a variety of ideas.

The assessment system for this unit is in a continuing state of refinement and enhancement. Some examples of this positive movement toward a more useful and informative system are described below.

There are some assessment data collected for the graduate programs beyond credential related program areas (i.e. Curriculum Teaching and Learning, CTL MA). However, the unit is just beginning to collect and use these data for program improvement purposes. Aspects of the assessment cycle described in the IR have already been implemented, but the completion of the evaluation cycle for those assessments is in progress.

Dispositions identified for all programs are on a trajectory for a more consistent, systematic means for data collection and format of reporting.

The unit is developing enhanced means to report assessment processes and maintain specific data sets. Moodle is the management system that will make the process of collecting, storing, aggregating and disaggregating data more efficient and meaningful.

There are examples in some data sets indicating that a portion of students feel they were less than adequately prepared in some aspects of their professional preparation experience. Faculty are examining these data to determine if they are consistent with other data points that address the same issues of candidate competence.

Where grades are used as the system to determine candidate competence, the details of how rubrics are used to drive grade decisions needs to be further explicated. An example of a program area where this need exists is in Reading. This concern was also pointed out in the most recent Biennial Report feedback from the CTC.

The unit is aware of specific areas where there is limited documentation that details the implementation of the assessment system. For example, meeting minutes showing advisory group involvement in examination of data, and of how those data influence program modification, could be posted in the Moodle assessment management system. This more careful documentation is in the process of being implemented.

2.6 NCATE Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

Advanced Preparation: Met

CTC Decision for Standard 2: Met

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The evidence presented in the unit's Institutional Report, observations by the onsite review team, and interviews with unit faculty, school-based faculty, and candidates support the continuing effort of the unit to design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice.

The unit's program coordinators manage the field experiences that precede student teaching. Unit faculty supervise the candidates enrolled in the courses in which the field experiences occur. School faculty and administrators collaborate with unit faculty in the design of these field experiences. Field experiences and clinical practice requirements in the programs are described in the course syllabi and handbooks. Descriptions of each program's practicum include number of hours and examples of assignments. Placements are tracked by SOE staff. Data contained within this system are reviewed continuously. SOE staff posts announcements of informational workshops held on a monthly basis to guide candidates through the application process, as well as provide other information candidates need to know and/or act on. Candidates can view their own transcripts, which are maintained by the University.

SOE has Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with 31 districts and 87 schools for initial candidates' early field placements, clinical practice, and internships. Advanced candidates work in two states, 17 districts, and 92 schools.

A Community Advisory Committee (CAC) within each program meets to discuss fieldwork and clinical practice issues concerning program development, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences; development of policies and procedures; and candidate work. Minutes of meetings confirmed that they meet at least once every semester.

Initial program candidate placement is made by collaboration with the partner schools and the unit through coordination between the Director of Field Placement and personnel in the P-12 schools. Criteria for the selection of resident teachers, mentors, and clinical faculty as well as their responsibilities are found in each program's handbook. Resident teachers and mentors are recommended by their principals. They must be credentialed, be tenured and/or have completed three years of certified teaching, as well demonstrate exemplary teaching and/or professional development.

Unit supervisors must demonstrate experience in the specific credential program area. They are selected on the basis of their experience, as verified in faculty vitae. A unit supervisor and a site-based mentor are provided through the unit's intern partner, the North Coast Beginning Teacher Program (NCBTP). This is a regional consortium comprised of multiple county offices of education, universities, and over 100 school districts, charter schools, and private schools throughout Contra Costa, Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, Nevada, Solano and Sonoma Counties. The NCBTP director spoke highly of the program with SSU, stating that, "There is a family feeling because of the dedication of the faculty." She noted that strong relationships have been built over time.

Advanced program candidates may complete assignments in the classroom or school in which they are employed. A school-based mentor and a faculty supervisor are assigned to administrative and education specialist candidates and administrative interns. Reading and language certificate candidates are required to participate in an intensive summer program at a local school. The coordinator of the pupil personnel services credential program collaborates with the school personnel in the placement of pupil personnel candidates for their 3-step sequential program. Curriculum development/implementation or research within coursework is required in many Masters of Arts programs. Examples of coursework assignments were viewed on-site.

Faculty and resident teachers/mentors work in partnership to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice. Documents indicate that candidates participate in a variety of field experiences that are designed to permit them to observe in schools and assist teachers prior to clinical practice. These clinical and field experiences have been designed and developed to reflect institutional, state, and professional standards and serve to transform the conceptual framework from application of theory to practice. During interviews, clinical faculty and candidates noted that unit supervisors are incredibly responsive, available, and knowledgeable. Supervisors meet with mentors frequently, teach demo lessons, and maintain close contact with clinical faculty and candidates.

Clinical faculty spoke highly of SSU candidates and graduates. Administrators stated emphatically that they have and will continue to hire teachers that have completed the SSU program over those from other institutions. The cycle from SSU candidates to teachers to cooperating teachers to administrators was clearly evidenced during interviews and the site visit. A majority of the teachers at the partner school visited are SSU program completers, and many are selected to be mentors. School administrators stated that SSU graduates had a better understanding of standards based curriculum, utilized varied strategies in Reading, are well-prepared for their own classroom, and do not need "re-teaching." One also stated that SSU has "high expectations for teacher quality" in all aspects of the program and they "deliver."

Field experience evaluation instruments are designed to ensure that candidates meet the requirements that increase as they go from one experience to the next. Initial candidates participate in a performance assessment that includes planning for instruction, implementing and evaluating instruction, assessing student learning, and focused reflection. The "Take-Over" is the capstone experience, wherein the candidate assumes full responsibility of the classroom toward the end of clinical practice. The dispositions are also assessed in the early field experiences.

Specific entry and exit criteria for early field placements and clinical practice in each program are comprised of critical assessments. While the requirements and assessments are program specific, all candidates are evaluated at a minimum of three transition points: prior to clinical practice, during clinical practice, and after completing clinical practice. Candidates must pass the entry assessment to begin clinical practice, and pass the exit assessment to be awarded their initial teaching credentials. Candidate portfolios, assessments, and assignments were viewed on Moodle. Candidates stated that they knew their requirements, as well as the grading systems and rubrics for coursework and assignments.

During the clinical practice, a minimum of three observations are made by the clinical faculty. Written evaluations are completed by the unit supervisor and the resident teacher, along with continuous formative assessments via observation and feedback conferences. Assessment rubrics are utilized. The candidate, unit supervisor, and resident teacher participate in a final evaluation required by most programs. Completed evaluations are used by academic programs for grading and are shared in several ways, electronically, as well as on paper.

Reflective activities are included in coursework for candidates throughout early fieldwork, clinical practice, internships and advanced programs. All programs maintain an assessment system following PEARL (Pursuing Excellence through Assessment, Reflection, and Learning). This system measures four pieces of initial and advanced preparation: (1) candidate evaluation, (2) faculty evaluation, (3) program evaluation, and (4) unit evaluation. Reflection is focused on self-assessment and impact on student achievement. Work samples and portfolios affirmed extensive reflection by candidates. During interviews, candidates attested that they reflect daily, and after each lesson. They stated that often their reflections include discussions with peers as well as cooperating teachers and clinical faculty.

Advanced candidates complete field-based assignments connecting the course content, professional standards, and the candidate's particular school setting. Administrative credential program candidates complete action research projects, interviews, and case studies. Education specialists complete applied field projects and a professional induction plan to align course assignments to their particular school and classroom. Reading and language program candidates write case studies and clinical assessment reports. PPS program candidates complete videotape reviews and case presentations. Every advanced program includes field-based projects and/or research as a critical assessment. Without successfully passing these assignments, the candidates will not be awarded their credential and/or advanced degree. Assignments are developed, reviewed, and evaluated by site-based mentors, unit supervisors, and faculty.

The unit utilizes Moodle, an electronic filing system, as an online learning environment and information repository and as an organizing device for program assessment and accreditation, program data, digital portfolios in the multiple subject credential program, online student participation requirements, meeting minutes, and assignments requiring the use of technology. These were viewed during both the off-site and on-site visit. Faculty and candidates stated that Moodle allows them to interact with each other as needed.

Every program admits candidates based on defined admission criteria and procedures, including all California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) adopted requirements. Multiple subject and single subject program candidates must also complete the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). Education Specialists complete a Teaching Event that mirrors the PACT assessment.

The technology standards of the CTC Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) are infused in the coursework for Multiple and Single Subject credentials. The unit acknowledges the need to clarify and explain where these competencies are demonstrated by candidates during field based experiences and assignments. Candidates have multiple opportunities to utilize technology to enhance student learning. Interviews with candidates and cooperating teachers/mentors confirmed the use of available technology. Candidates also affirmed that unit faculty modeled technology usage in courses. Cooperating teachers stated that candidates were eager to use available technology.

SSU continually evaluates programs and candidate performance with regular data reviews. Clearly defined entry and exit criteria exist in all programs. Interviews with the professional community confirm SSU's commitment to partnerships with schools. SSU is seen as open, involving, and inviting in working with the P-12 community. Coursework, field experiences, and clinical practice provide opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn and include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and/or socioeconomic groups.

3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The vision statement, mission statement, and performance expectations and dispositions were rewritten in 2007 as a result of reflective examination and evaluation. Collaborative meetings occur at least once each semester in each program's CAC, resulting in modifications to programs. Clinical faculty expressed concern that some candidates did not have writing competency, resulting in the creation of the Writing Center. Data collected through the PEARL assessment system has driven program changes. Embedded performance assessments within field experiences have been systematically integrated into credential programs.

The state-mandated teacher performance assessments (PACT) were piloted in 2008 during clinical practice and subsequently implemented in 2009 for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs. CAC meetings have resulted in PACT information workshops and revised course assignments to support candidates in their PACT assessments.

The education specialist credential program was redesigned to meet state standards. Changes were made to the field experiences and clinical practices delivery in the program. It was decided that more field experience for candidates who do not hold a Multiple or Single Subject credential, as well as a common clinical experience evaluation instrument for interns and candidates, were needed. The development of a program portfolio with critical assignments to serve as the clinical practice entry assessment, aligned with the second early field experience is now part of a new seminar.

During the fall 2011 semester, a semester-long early field placement prior to clinical practice in the same classroom setting was implemented to provide candidates with a more extensive opportunity to gain knowledge about the classroom and the role of the teacher.

The field sites in the MS program were consolidated to give early field experience candidates opportunities to collaborate with each other. The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program redesigned its mid-program review and capstone field experience. The Single Subject Credential program's decision to have candidates in schools more has led to discussion of a co-teaching clinical model.

3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

Advanced Preparation: Met

CTC Decision for Standard 3: Met

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all student learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Diversity is an integral part of Sonoma State University's and the School of Education's mission. It is clearly articulated in the major tenets of the unit's Conceptual Framework. Three of the seven Performance Expectations and four of the six dispositions of the Conceptual Framework are explicitly focused on one or more aspects of diversity.

The unit broadly defines diversity to include English language learners, gender, sexual orientation, students from low-income backgrounds, and students with exceptionalities and it has developed proficiencies related to diversity that are interwoven throughout coursework and assessments.

The unit provides curriculum for candidates to learn about (1) exceptionalities and inclusion, (2) English language learners and language acquisition, (3) ethnic/racial and cultural groups (4) linguistic differences, and (5) gender differences, and the impact of these factors on learning. Diversity curriculum matrices have been developed for each program to identify and document the relevant knowledge and skills needed and where and when these are assessed.

Evidence of the strong diversity curriculum was provided in the interviews with faculty and candidates. The field experiences and the clinical practices provide the opportunity for the candidates to apply their knowledge of diversity and inclusion with the diverse students that they teach or serve. The faculty and candidates stated during interviews that the cohort model provides opportunities for enriched discussions of diversity issues.

As a part of each program, at least one key assessment, each with multiple measures, exists related to candidates' ability to work with diverse learners. Some examples include lesson plans and instructional strategies of an inclusive classroom, case studies, unit plans, and a cultural project. Coursework, field experiences, and clinical practice provide direction to help candidates understand the influence of culture on education and acquire the ability to develop meaningful learning experiences for all students.

As part of a key assessment for the Multiple Subject Credential Program and the Single Subject Credential Program, candidates use their growing knowledge of diversity to teach, assess

learning, and reflect on student growth and their own teaching in culturally, linguistically, and academically appropriate and effective way. This teaching event/assessment, the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), is required for the Multiple and Single Subject credential programs. A similar teaching event/ assessment is required of the Educational Specialist Program. The Educational Leadership Program has a project assigned as part of their diversity course that requires candidates to be assigned to a placement out of their “comfort zone”.

In addition, each program assesses the candidates during student teaching or internship, focusing on the candidates proficiencies related to diversity. Examples of these key assessments were shared during the onsite visit. It was evident that the idea of diversity and multiple perspectives of diversity are embraced by both the faculty and the candidates.

Unit faculty, with whom the candidates interact in professional education classes and clinical practice, have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities, as evidenced by the large number of faculty professional presentations and papers focused on issues of diversity.

According to the IR and data tables provided, faculty presented 106 papers related to diversity, 65 at national and international professional meetings, and 41 at state, regional and 33 local meetings. Topics addressed in these scholarly presentations include exceptionalities, bilingualism/second language learning, and sexual orientation. In addition, faculty published 51 articles and book chapters related to diversity between 2002 and 2011.

Candidates interact with professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and/or school faculty, both male and female, from a variety of ethnic/racial groups. The female-male ratio among faculty matches that of the teaching candidates. Faculty ethnicity matches that of candidates. Minority faculty comprise 27.8 % of the faculty. An area that continues to be a challenge for the unit is the effort to increase the diversity of the faculty and the candidates.

The unit makes an effort to ensure that candidates have opportunities to interact with students from diverse backgrounds. The candidates stated that they work together on group projects and that they are able to share multiple perspectives on the issues of diversity. They feel that they benefit from working as teams. As stated in the IR, an area that continues to be a challenge for the SOE is the effort to increase the diversity of SOE candidates.

The female-male ratio of candidates has remained rather constant over the last 5 years, with males comprising one-fifth to one quarter of candidates. The percentage of minority candidates has risen slowly over the past five years: 12.1, 11.7, 13.1, 12.6, and 16.2, respectively. Hispanic-Latino candidates continue to comprise the largest minority group.

Field experiences and clinical practice for initial programs provide experiences with male and female P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups and a variety of ethnic/racial groups. Many candidates also work with ELL students and students with disabilities during field experiences or clinical practice to develop and practice their knowledge, skills and professional dispositions for working with all students. According to many candidates, from all of the programs, this is the strength of the unit programs.

Data tables provide evidence, by program, about the diversity of the P-12 school sites. Data is presented for the diverse population according to the percentage of English language learners (ELL), free lunches (FL), and minority students (ML). The data reported is only from four of the unit's programs, Multiple Subjects, Single Subjects, Special Education, and Counseling. Of the four programs surveyed, twenty-five percent of sites have high or medium levels of English language learners, 59.1% have high or medium levels of free lunch recipients, and 73.7% have high or medium levels of minority students. During interviews, candidates shared that they gained a tremendous amount of knowledge and insight about working with students with diverse needs during their field experiences and clinical practice. Their field experiences were invaluable.

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit continues good faith efforts to increase the pool of candidates, both male and female, from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups through outreach efforts. In an effort to increase the diversity of candidates, Early Childhood Education (ECE) faculty developed an undergraduate major in Early Childhood Studies. It provides outreach to diverse early childhood teacher candidates, including transfer students from Santa Rosa Junior College, minority and second language learners, and first-generation college students. Other exemplary efforts include the North Coast Beginning Teacher Paraprofessional Program, the Roseland University Preparatory High School Program, the Migrant Education Advisor Program, and the California Mini-Corps; all programs are designed to both serve the needs of the public school community and to potentially increase the number of diverse candidates.

During interviews with faculty and community partners, strong evidence of school initiatives and collaborative programs was shared. As these strategic programs are implemented, it is hopeful that there will be a rise in the number of SSU students and SOE candidates from diverse backgrounds as well as an increased attention to diversity related issues in the curriculum.

A new collaborative effort, SONELI, was discussed during onsite interviews. SOE is partnering with other local educational agencies to support education initiatives. The mission of the institute will be to support systematic research-based change in the local P-16 educational community to provide equal access to learning for all students through continuous program improvement and collaboration across the local educational community. Also discussed was EnACT, a program that is grant funded to provide SOE faculty the support and training necessary to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a high quality education. These programs are supporting the faculty in professional development in diversity.

As stated in the IR, President Ruben Armiñana has established the President's Diversity Council (2008) that is charged with outreach recruitment and retention of diverse students, faculty and staff. In addition, the Academic Senate established the Senate Diversity Subcommittee in 2009 to ensure that diversity is strategically considered in all academic and student life areas. The unit has faculty participation in the Senate Diversity Subcommittee. The onsite visit provided evidence of campus-wide efforts on diversity displayed in the "Map" on the library wall illustrating all of the diversity efforts of the entire university. The "Map" was a visual display of the many ways that diversity is valued and respected at the university.

Efforts have continued to assist candidates in developing dispositions that will help them succeed as teachers and school leaders who view diversity as both strength and a challenge in organizing public schools that encourage P-12 students to live and contribute intellectually, socially and politically to a pluralistic society. (SOE IR, 2005) Interviews with candidates demonstrated their positive dispositions and in depth understanding of the needs of diverse P-12 students. When asking the employers to identify the best attribute of the unit's candidates, several replied the candidates have a passion for teaching and working with the diverse students in their schools, the candidates are well prepared to meet the diverse needs of their students.

4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

Advanced Preparation: Met

CTC Decision on Standard 4: Met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Tenure track (TT) faculty in the unit at SSU are required to have earned doctorates in their field or, in the case of those who do not, it is expected they will have special qualifications such as extensive experience or expertise. There are 20 full time faculty members in the SOE and 40 part-time faculty. There are three faculty members outside the SOE who teach Adaptive Physical Education, Music and English and they are considered to be members of the unit. There are also two faculty who participate in the faculty early retirement program, which allows them to work part-time and continue to receive benefits and earn credits toward retirement.

The SOE has lost nine tenure track positions since the last review due to budget cuts. SOE leaders were recently able to hire two new positions with one starting in the current academic year and another to begin in 2012-13. In the Institutional Report (IR), the unit maintains it has preserved quality in academic programs despite these losses in positions. Interviews with faculty support this contention. They indicated that the SOE has responded to these losses by increasing class sizes and they have had to modify their teaching in a number of ways. One faculty member noted that she informed her candidates that the issue with growing class sizes and shrinking resources is one that they will face as teachers. She asks her candidates to help her in creatively addressing this problem and asks that they work to support each other in their work. Faculty also noted that technology has helped them in their teaching and in modeling differentiation of instruction. Another step taken to address the loss of tenure track faculty has been the increase in hiring adjunct faculty, who are either full time with a three-year contract or part-time.

The IR provides evidence of faculty effectiveness in teaching for the past eight years. The scores on this 5 point scale reflect mean scores of over 4.0 on all items, however the “n” for these scores (the highest is 90) seems low if it is to reflect a summary of all faculty evaluations during that time period. Interviews with candidates provide evidence of faculty success in teaching. Candidates find their classes are meaningful and very helpful in preparing them for the field. Several candidates remarked on the accessibility of faculty outside of office hours. Many faculty share home numbers and are always available to provide support. One candidate noted she contacted her faculty supervisor after a particularly challenging day in the practicum. The faculty member appeared the next day in the candidate’s classroom. In sessions with current and future graduates, two candidates talked about the fact that their preparation was based on research, which gave them a good foundation to make decisions about instruction---not just a “list of great ideas and strategies” without a basis for making instructional decisions. One of these candidates talked about how she has had to support colleagues who were prepared by other institutions and who have gaps in their preparation.

The IR includes a list of strategies faculty stated that they use in teaching. These reflect a variety of approaches to teaching and assessment of candidates’ learning, which were also evident in a review of syllabi. For the most part, assignments are clearly defined and reflect work that promotes research, critical thinking and application to the classroom/school. The use of technology was evident in about half of the syllabi examined. Many syllabi cite web sites for assigned readings. Moodle is the primary technology tool noted with some faculty requiring candidates to email assignment. The SOE has fully adopted Moodle as a learning tool and as a storage area for unit assessments and data. Three of the newer faculty approached the dean about their concerns with the lack of faculty who fully understand and embrace technology. They requested support for them to get additional preparation in technology so that they could support faculty within their departments and it was funded. The chairs report that this is working very well. The peer support is effective in reducing faculty anxiety and encouraging faculty to attempt new classroom initiatives. While certainly not pleased with the funding cuts that have affected their workload and their opportunities for professional development, faculty expressed an understanding for the difficult financial times and demonstrated continued commitment to excellence in teaching.

A review of faculty vita provides evidence that almost all of the faculty in the SOE have public school experience in their background. Some who have not worked in public schools have experience in private school-related organizations, which is particularly appropriate for faculty in the counseling program. A listing of activities of faculty in public schools demonstrates that 76% of tenured/tenured track (TT) faculty and 56% of adjuncts are involved beyond their role as supervisors of candidates. Faculty resumes support the fact that these numbers accurately demonstrate the amount of faculty engagement in the community. School administrators report that they frequently see faculty in their schools conducting supervision of candidates and their presence is valued. While they admit that they do not typically call upon faculty for professional development, they value the faculty’s expertise and reported that this is something the districts will consider in the future. They noted how readily accessible faculty are and that responses to phone calls and emails are almost immediate. In interviews, candidates were very complimentary of clinical faculty. They found them to be very accessible, supportive and helpful in developing candidates’ skills in teaching.

Faculty resumes indicate they are very knowledgeable of the areas that they teach. With regards to qualifications of clinical faculty/mentor teachers in P-12 schools, these individuals must be tenured and have at least three years of teaching as well as demonstrated excellence in their work. Tenure track faculty at Sonoma State University are evaluated systematically according to the guidelines written in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the CSU system and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Faculty must provide the following documentation: a self-assessment of their teaching and professional activity, two peer observations of teaching, at least two candidate evaluations of teaching effectiveness annually from two courses, appropriate evidence to support a record of growth and contribution in the area of scholarship (including research, creative achievement, and professional development) and evidence to support quality of service to the University and to the community.

There is no prescribed schedule for the evaluation of adjunct faculty. Currently, all adjuncts are evaluated by candidates at the end of a course. Evaluations of adjuncts by the chair are not consistent across departments as there is no policy or process in place. In some cases, adjuncts are only evaluated if candidates' scores on a course evaluation are low. The unit has expressed concern about the lack of a prescribed plan and schedule for evaluating adjuncts, and it is working to adopt a common schedule and evaluation instrument. The same is true for post-tenure review and the SOE noted in the IR that this is also a process that needs to be delineated. The agreement the CSU and the CFA states that periodic evaluations of tenured faculty shall occur at intervals no more frequent than the greatest interval permitted by the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in effect at the time of the evaluation, which in this case is every 5 years. However, on page of the IR it states, "Periodic review of tenured faculty takes place on a yearly basis through the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion process." In interviews with faculty and chairs, it was reported that evaluation of tenured faculty is not consistently implemented.

The university policy for promotion and tenure requires an annual review of tenure track faculty who are on probationary status. The criteria for evaluation includes (1) teaching effectiveness (or equivalent for librarians), (2) scholarship, research, creative achievement, and professional development, (3) service to the university and (4) public service and service to the community.

5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has continued to employ faculty who have expertise and qualifications to maintain excellence in teaching. Despite cutbacks in the number of faculty and the resulting increase in workload, the faculty have been able to maintain a high level of scholarship and service. They model effective teaching practices and are making a concerted effort to increase the use of technology in their teaching. The SOE and the university have provided extensive support for the development of faculty skill in using technology in instruction. The commitment of faculty to the program and candidates is commendable. Employers and candidates repeatedly talked about the accessibility of faculty and the extensive support faculty provide to candidates.

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

Advanced Preparation: Met

CTC Decision on Standard 5: Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Overall Findings.

The School of Education (SOE) oversees the planning, organization, and delivery of programs preparing candidates for teaching, educational administration, and other professional school personnel. The Dean of SOE serves as the unit leader, the three department chairs serve as faculty academic leaders, and the administrative manager serves as the staff leader. The Deans of Social Sciences and Science and Technology each have responsibilities for a program housed within their respective schools. Within the unit, the Office of Student Services, which includes both the Credentials Office and the Admissions Office, offers support for candidates and faculty relative to admission and advising. Additionally, academic advising is done by faculty in each program. Administrative Coordinators are responsible for procedural work associated with department and school business.

The Council of Chairs, the leadership team within the school, includes the dean, the department chairs, and the administrative manager as well as the Director of Graduate Studies and the Director of Accreditation.

Several other committees comprise the unit's committee structure ensuring joint governance and accountability. The Assessment and Accreditation Committee membership includes faculty from each department and the Director of Assessment and Accreditation. The unit's Curriculum Committee, comprised of elected representatives from each department, oversees curricular decisions following the university Curriculum Procedures and Guidelines policy document. The Technology Committee, in conjunction with the university instructional technology unit, reviews technological needs and allocates resources to the unit. Retention, tenure, and promotion committees (RTP) at all levels are comprised of elected faculty and make decisions regarding retention, tenure, and promotion.

The SOE, as one of five academic schools, receives state-appropriated funds annually based on projected Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES), using Student Faculty Ratio (SFR) from the previous year. The SOE enrolls seven percent of the University's FTES but receives ten percent of funds to academic schools. State funds support instructional salaries, student services, department chairs, support staff, accreditation and assessment, dean's office, faculty development and travel, and department operations and supplies. Current budget cuts reflect a decrease in funding commensurate with decreases in state budget allocations and FTES. This has resulted in a decrease of part-time faculty, larger SFR, larger classes, and reductions in operating funds. However, the unit currently receives adequate funds to maintain clinical fieldwork and work with PreK-12 schools and was able to establish a permanent line item for accreditation/assessment work. In addition, the provost's office has been able to provide one-time professional development funds annually (distributed to departments based on full-time tenure/tenure track faculty). The university supports a four year replacement cycle for faculty computers which frees money at the school level to address faculty needs for software or other technology resources. The Joint Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership runs in partnership with University of California Davis, which supplies annual funding for instructional and operational expenditures.

The provost's office currently maintains control of funding for part-time faculty (based on SFR), new full-time tenure-track faculty positions, sabbaticals, and approved school/program needs. The university Dean's council approves allocation of these funds.

Over the three years prior to creating the IR, the SOE pursued external funding and was granted \$1.8 million, including grants from NOYCE, SMTRI, Chemistry Facetss, and EnACT-PTD. Scholarship awards for SOE candidates were commensurate with other academic schools.

The unit follows California State University Memorandum of Understanding policies concerning faculty workload, tenure, and promotion. Faculty teach 12 Weighted Teaching Unit (WTU) per semester and additionally perform the equivalent of three WTUs of service to the institution including student advising, university and community service, and scholarly activity; for compensation of supervision, two students equal one WTU. Assigned time may be provided for administrative duties and temporary projects. Faculty may be awarded one-time funding opportunities for research projects or technology support. New faculty members receive a reduced teaching load. Support personnel provide excellent support and service to the academic unit to meet the needs of faculty and students. A recent restructuring has allowed the staff to provide improved service while utilizing fewer financial resources.

6.2 Continuous Improvement

According to an interview with the council members, under the current leadership, this high functioning, collegial group uses two to three council meetings as open forums to deal with issues concerning coordination of programs, policy, assessment, and budget. Council members are responsible for taking issues, as appropriate, to respective departments/programs for discussion, feedback, and consideration. Additionally, to ensure communication with other constituencies, agendas and minutes are posted on the SOE website.

Advisory committees for each program include members drawn from cooperating teachers, school counselors, field supervisors, administrators, former students, and community leaders. Boards meet regularly to consider program design, program implementation, program evaluation and candidate evaluation. Evidence indicates that the unit is committed to working with school partners to share professional development opportunities. For example, the Early Childhood Education Advisory Board, made up of community agency and institution personnel, was instrumental in identifying the need for an Early Childhood major. The board was engaged in the conception and development of the newly designed program now awaiting Chancellor's Office approval. Another example comes from the CORE Community Advisory Board. The members (faculty, resident teachers, supervisors, principals) reported that the advisory board facilitated program improvement, served as a sounding board for both schools and the institution, and offered an opportunity for individuals from different schools to share ideas and information.

A majority of the classrooms used by the unit are technology enhanced, and include computers, LCD projectors, document cameras, and VCR/DVD projectors. The campus boasts an endowed, state-of-the art library that includes access seven days a week, access to numerous electronic information sources, and technology such as streaming video. Faculty and students are able to use the Interlibrary Loan Program that includes all CSU and UC materials. A mathematics curriculum lab, equipped for instructional technology, and a science lab are accessible to students

and faculty. Each faculty member has a reasonably equipped office. The unit employs an assessment director that oversees the Unit Assessment system.

The institution offers resources and technology to support teaching and learning. Faculty are provided support, via workshops, to learn new technology and software. Students and faculty have access to library resources and technology support, including seven labs with 24/7 availability and an IT Help Desk. The campus has selected Moodle as its web platform for data gathering, information distribution, and instruction delivery. Campus services include Moodle assistance, video production, and web services.

6.6 NCATE Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

Advanced Preparation: Met

CTC Decision on Standard 6: Met

CTC COMMON STANDARDS NOT ADDRESSED BY NCATE UNIT STANDARDS

CTC Common Standard 1.1

Met

The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Findings:

Sonoma State has procedures in place for each credential program where the credential analyst verifies that all credential requirements have been met by the candidate for the multiple and single subject programs. For all other programs, verification is completed within the program by the directors and a program completion notification is provided to the credential analyst. The credential analyst verifies the transcripts and completion documentation and then submits the electronic recommendation to the Commission. She consistently attends all available credential requirement workshops and reviews all information that is distributed from the Commission. The analyst also provides faculty and administration with new official correspondence from the Commission related to their respective programs.

The credential analyst provides advisement to candidates regarding credential requirements for the state and the application process within the introductory program courses and again in their final semester or the program. The credential analyst is also available to all applicants and candidates for questions.

Qualified members of the Unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The Unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Findings:

Across all credential programs, candidates are advised and assisted by faculty advisors, who provide academic and professional guidance. A number of professional staff, including the Credential Analyst, the Admission Specialist, and the Director of Field Experiences also meet individually with students to provide consistent advice and assistance. Candidates report a clear understanding of the requirements for course sequence and field work placements. Information is provided to candidates through handbooks, tracking forms, and the website. The University also provides additional career services support to candidates.

The University provides a range of support for candidates who need special assistance, including counseling services, an Office of Services for Students with Disabilities, and the Education Resource Center. Test preparation is offered for the CBEST and CSET exams. Advisors and program chairs meet with students to create remedial plans if necessary, based on feedback from assessments (such as PACT) or other evidence of difficulty (such as field work evaluation) at the various stages of the programs. If candidates are unsuccessful after implementation of remedial plans, they would typically be counseled out of the program. Candidates report successful remediation provided based on specific learning disabilities, presentation skill development and advanced writing.

Program Accreditation Reports

Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential Program

Program Design

The Multiple Subjects Credential Program at Sonoma State University is in the Literacy, Education, and Early Education Department in the School of Education. The department is lead by a Chair and advisor. There is a structured system of advising that students are made aware of during large advising sessions and in the handbook. All faculty assist in advising students throughout the program and there is constant communication within the department to meet the needs of all of their students. Candidates and completers agreed that all faculty are approachable and any concerns they have with the program are quickly identified and addressed.

Program courses are available to full- and part-time teacher candidates through late afternoon and evening classes. The program design has three components. Prerequisites/Co-requisite, Phase I with methods courses and field experiences (Participant Observation), and Phase II with methods courses and field experiences (Full Time Student Teaching). The Program promotes a constructivist approach to learning in which candidates learn to create environments where students can build on prior knowledge and work collaboratively with teachers and fellow students to construct new knowledge through active experiences with learning materials and academic texts. Candidates noted the hands-on experiences and inquiry-based lessons they are receiving and felt that there was a close match between theory and practice.

The school has adopted the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) as the TPA assessment. The School of Education has spent two years in PACT adoption, training and piloting. PACT components are now fully incorporated into all phases of the program. Other changes during the time frame of this report include the cessation of the Bilingual Program, and the temporary suspension of the Ukiah Outreach Program.

According to faculty and chair, recent changes made from an analysis of data include teaching student to focus more on academic language, more support with using technology, and being more deliberate about labeling teaching theories and terminology and supporting students in their ability to discuss them. Employers noted this by citing evidence of their student teachers being able to speak on a much higher level about educational theories and practices. Candidates and completers praised the move towards using Moodle and encouraged more consistent use of Moodle among all faculty. Other technology improvements have been appreciated, although not always relevant for them at the school sites where they are placed.

Employers conferred that there have been continuous improvement in many areas that include demographic shifts in candidates, the increased partnerships between schools and the university, an increase in candidates' competency in working with English learners (ELs) and students with special needs, a focus on early literacy and reading skills, the implementation of PACT, and the increase in more hands-on experience opportunities for candidates.

Course of Study

The design of the Multiple Subject program is developmental and sequential. The program is divided into two phases, with candidates building upon learning that was attained during the prior semester. Prerequisite courses for the program provide candidates a foundation on which to build their professional knowledge. Phase I coursework focuses on teaching methods of content areas

that candidates will observe during their participation observation placement. Student teaching dominates the Phase II semester with additional courses that deepen candidates' understanding of pedagogy increase synthesis and reflection of their teaching.

Candidates appreciate the flexibility of being full-time or part-time students and also commented about the quality of faculty, noting appreciation for their elementary teaching experiences and their practical knowledge is relevant to the candidates understanding.

Each course includes lesson planning and making accommodations for English learners (ELs) and students with special needs. Candidates feel well prepared to teach these populations, especially the ELs. Some completers expressed a greater need for practical ideas of working with specific handicap groups that are of high incidence in their classrooms. One area where candidates expressed need for more preparation was classroom management. Cooperating teachers and employers concurred that classroom management could be included in all courses as it relates to the different content areas.

The CORE model (Collaboration for Renewal of Education) is the professional partnership program in which both part-time and full time student teachers are placed for in depth fieldwork with public school partners. CORE is grounded in knowledge about teacher education, which emphasizes the importance of learning communities and close connections between coursework and fieldwork. According to the faculty, it runs like a medical model with “interns, residents, and doctors”. At each CORE school site, a critical mass of 10-12 candidates work together with Cooperating Teachers (doctors) and University Supervisors to create a multilevel learning community. Phase I or Part-time Participant Observers (interns) and Phase II, Full-time Student Teachers (residents) are paired in classrooms and work collaboratively together in the field. Assessment and reflection is encouraged through group observations of peers' lessons and group debriefing sessions that emphasize lesson strengths and next steps. Weekly supervisor-led on-site seminars address critical issues related to the experiences of candidates in their classrooms. Employers reported that often the administrators and other teachers not mentoring are invited to attend the collaboration and act as guest speakers adding to the community of learners. According to employers, including Superintendents, these CORE sites are highly diverse, including ELs, low socioeconomic status, urban/rural, small and large. Preparing candidates to work with a more diverse population they have one site situated as far south as Oakland, in order to provide a more urban experience for the candidates.

Employers and cooperating teachers confirmed that the CORE model has been an opportunity for ongoing communication and collaboration between local schools and university faculty, and has contributed to the growth of the elementary school faculty. They find it refreshing that the focus is on doing what is best for the students. University supervisors become part of the teaching staff at the school site and are there a full day each week. Candidates also appreciate this model, however, they liked the idea from their single subject colleagues of having the opportunity to observe in many classrooms at the beginning of the semester and then have some choice in the selection of their cooperating teacher. Candidates believe that this model is giving them more opportunities to be paired with cooperating teachers that are more willing to be innovative rather than what they referred to as “traditional”.

A concern that surfaced from candidates was that they are not all receiving similar student teaching experiences. They felt that this could be alleviated by the cooperating teachers referring

to the handbooks. One cooperating teacher commented that the university supervisor was helpful by sending reminders about protocols and referenced actual page numbers from the handbook. Ongoing evaluation occurs during Phase II. Monthly supervisor meeting discussions include observation debriefing, protocols for observations, placements, cooperating teacher selection, and any concerns regarding candidates.

Candidate Competence

All candidates receive deep, recursive, and continuing experiences working with the State academic standards through a variety of assignments, readings, in-class learning activities and field experiences that are tied to the TPEs. The major evaluation instruments used in the program are tied to the TPEs, they include: Phase I portfolio, the Phase 2-PACT portfolio, the field evaluations, and the observation form used extensively in the field by supervisors, cooperating teachers, and peers. Each of these assessment tools has the TPEs and the Standards for the Teaching Profession as rubric descriptors. The field-based foundation of the Multiple Subject Program provides candidates multiple opportunities to observe, participate and teach in various public school classrooms. Final confirmation of candidate mastery of TPAs is assessed through the completion of the portfolios and the two-week takeover during full-time student teaching in Phase II.

Fieldwork incorporates numerous informal and formal evaluations. Scheduled meetings with cooperating teachers, student teachers, and university supervisors are held to discuss strengths of candidates and determine areas for improvement. When necessary, all faculty involved with candidates who are struggling meet to determine action plans. In addition, supervisors meet monthly to discuss protocols, placements, cooperating teacher selections, and to determine areas of focus during weekly seminars with candidates. They are currently in the process of receiving IRB approval for a study on their co-teaching model CORE program.

Assessments are disaggregated by standards and analyzed by faculty. Trends are noted and become topics of discussion at faculty meetings. Program modifications are made based on data and discussions. Faculty are involved in continuous improvement and candidates and employers are reporting on the progress.

Area employers expressed their respect for candidates and graduates and hire the majority of their teachers from the program. They feel that SSU candidates are well rounded, see the connection between theory and practice, understand the standards for the teaching profession, show great passion for the profession, and are highly qualified teachers. Candidates and completers feel that they leave the program well prepared and have a toolbox of strategies and activities that they can use.

A confidential survey is required by all of the teacher candidates before credentialing. This enables the Department to reflect on advising issues and program courses, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the program. It also registers the level of satisfaction with the program on the part of the candidates creating a valuable feedback loop for program improvements. Again, candidates believe that their feedback is valued as they have seen improvements based on their comments.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, cooperating teachers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Single Subject Teaching Credential Program with Internship

Program Design

The Single Subject Credential Program with Internship, is housed in the Department of Curriculum Studies and Secondary Education (CSSE) and is one of three departments in the School of Education at Sonoma State University. The program offers credentials in eight areas of authorization including English, mathematics, social science, science, foreign language, music, art, and physical education. It also links with four undergraduate subject matter programs in English, mathematics, music and physical education.

Resources are allocated to the program for coordination, admission, advising, curriculum, instruction, and field experiences. A program advisor fields inquiries to the program and the Student Services staff (includes admissions and credentialing) and holds workshops once a month during academic semesters. The Student Services staff also assists with organizing interviews for students wishing to apply to the program, administers and coordinates candidates files keeping them up-to-date making sure all students are adhering to both CTC and Single Subject program requirements. Each faculty member is assigned candidates to advise one-on-one during their stay in the program. Each candidate is also assigned a subject matter advisor who is available to advise candidates on issues related specifically to their subject area. More information on advising is also available in the programs' handbook. Perspective candidates, current candidates, and recent graduates found that information was readily available, faculty were quick to respond to inquiries, and felt that they could find the answers to any of their questions.

The Program requires nine units of pre- or co-requisite coursework, plus a two-phase credential program that totals 33 units. It is designed so candidates who take the pre/co-requisites prior to beginning the program can finish their program in two semesters. In Phase I, candidates take courses focused on pedagogy based on current research and theory. This includes field experience that begins with observation and adds increasing levels of participation in the classrooms. In Phase II, the candidates' major focus is student teaching, which takes place at their Phase I field site, accompanied by a seminar at the University. This is an area where faculty is considering a change. They are currently rethinking their student teaching model and trying to implement the CORE model as described in the multiple subject program.

The Single Subject Professional Teacher Preparation and Internship Programs engage in collaborative partnerships with numerous entities both within Sonoma State University, and with local schools and school districts. Cooperating teachers of the program report that their relationship with the University is strong and reciprocal; they enjoy learning from their student teachers. Employers also commented on the relationships between their schools and the universities and appreciate the opportunity to collaborate. University faculty are seen as an important member of the school's faculty.

Faculty reported that the department is reflecting on areas for continual improvement and use data to inform changes to their program. They have embraced the opportunity to participate in a cycle of assessment, analysis, and change. According to faculty and the chair, recent changes made from an analysis of data include more support with using technology, a focus on students using more academic language, and being more deliberate about discussing teaching theories and terminology. Employers noted this by citing evidence of their student teachers were well spoken about educational theories and practices. Candidates and recent graduates noted the improvement of technology, namely Moodle, and suggested that this be more consistent across the program. Another area for change noted by faculty was the removal of portfolios when PACT was implemented. They are reconsidering this decision and would like to include portfolios as a bridge from coursework to student teaching and a key assessment at this transition point.

Changes in the program over the past years are noticed by employers and cooperating teachers, they all felt that there has been continuous improvement in the program. Areas where they have seen program growth include demographic shifts, an increase in candidates' competency in working with English learners (ELs), the implementation of PACT, and candidates have more opportunities to use or plan for technology.

Course of Study

The Single Subject Professional Teacher Preparation Program consists of prerequisites and two phases of instruction that moves from an emphasis on general issues in education (i.e., social contexts of education, adolescent development, teaching adolescents with special needs, teaching in a multicultural classroom) to curriculum methods (i.e., subject specific curriculum issues, literacy across the curriculum) and classroom applications (i.e., field experiences and student teaching). Throughout the program, considerable integration of knowledge occurs so that within the context of each classroom component of the program courses and field experiences, explicit and focused attention is given to cultural and linguistic issues associated with an increasingly multicultural/multilingual school population. Recent graduates appreciated the emphasis on adolescent development as it is critical to their instructional decision making.

Candidates respect the fact that the instructors have teaching experiences and model connections from theory to practice. Recent graduates confirmed that the faculty modeled good practices that have carried over into their own teaching. Faculty and Chair discussed the use of SDAIE methods in all courses and that a key assignment includes working with ELs. Cooperating teachers confirmed that candidates were well prepared to teach ELs and appreciated learning new strategies from their candidates.

The integration of coursework and field experience continues in Phase II of the program, where students complete their student teaching while enrolled in the student teaching seminar. Student teaching consists of teaching two to three periods a day. In the seminars students assist one another to solve problems encountered in their teaching assignments; listen to a variety of invited experts on a range of key issues; draw connection between what is going on in their teaching and the theoretical groundwork and teaching strategies they learned in Phase I. Half of the supervisors also teach courses in the program. Recent graduates felt that the university supervisors were very supportive during student teaching. Cooperating teachers also commented on the increase in communication with university supervisors and their level of involvement at the school sites. A concern that surfaced from candidates was that they are not all receiving

similar student teaching experiences. They felt that this could be alleviated by the cooperating teachers referring to the handbooks. One cooperating teacher commented that the university supervisor was helpful by sending reminders about protocols and referenced actual page numbers to the handbook.

Candidate Competence

Evaluation of candidate competence is ongoing and progressive throughout the Program, with attention paid to the indicators of quality and competence identified in the Teaching Performance Expectations. During student teaching, university supervisors and cooperating teachers provide formal and informal feedback to candidates. Formal feedback consists of written comments and evaluations on forms aligned with the TPEs, individual conferences, and group conferences. Data from these evaluations are used to plan topics for seminars.

There are several checkpoints where the assessment of candidates takes place, and an assessment matrix with key assignments is used at each transition point. The Department Chair is responsible for monitoring candidate progress. Faculty assess the quality of student work using multiple forms of assessment in their program courses, and the PACT assessment. The candidate's self-reflection is also included. This data is discussed and analyzed at regular faculty meetings to make improvements to the program.

A variety of program assessments are used that involve program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences, which lead to substantive improvements in the credential preparation program. The Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor evaluations of student teachers' performance are submitted online at the end of candidates' Phase II student teaching semester. Assessment results, as well as assessment procedures and the instrument itself, are examined in a variety of settings and are topics of discussion at meetings. The program uses a key assessment matrix at each transition point.

PACT data is disaggregated and trends are analyzed and discussed for areas of improvement. Recent data show that the students need more work on using academic language and using technology. Professional development for faculty on these areas are planned to support the improvements. Current candidates and recent graduates both commented on the improvements they are seeing in this area.

Teacher candidates themselves complete an evaluation of the Single Subject Program as an online exit survey after they have completed all program requirements and are filing for their credential. The CSU Graduate Survey is administered to first-year teachers and their supervisors. This provides the opportunity to program evaluation within the immediate context and within the larger context of the entire CSU.

Cooperating Teachers reported that candidates were well prepared to teach their assigned subject areas and are competent at planning for ELs. They are so confident of their student teachers' competence that they use them as substitute teachers. They felt that their preparation for working with students with special needs could be improved but were impressed with the willingness for candidates to ask for help when they needed it. Recent graduates raised a concern about their preparation for working with students with special needs. They reported that they would have liked to learn more about different disability categories and how they could help those students be

successful in their classrooms. They also needed strategies for working with advanced children, and students who do not qualify for special education services and who are struggling.

Employers confirmed that Sonoma State graduates are highly qualified teachers and prefer to hire them over graduates from other programs. They reported that even with current budget cuts and lack of jobs they find these graduates passionate about teaching. Employers and cooperating teachers were excited to report that last year's student teacher of the year was a single subject candidate.

Current candidates and recent graduates thought their coursework and program made them well prepared, but commented on the need to add a few more topics to be covered. They would like to see more subject matter preparation, classroom management- especially specific to content areas, more about the use of assessment, creating assessments and rubrics, and other nuts and bolts such as long term lesson planning and grading.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Reading Certificate Program Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

Program Design

The Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Credential Programs are in the Department of Literacy, Elementary and Early Education. They are nested within the graduate program which may lead to a Master of Arts in Education with a concentration in Reading and Language. This program is in transition and is working towards meeting new program standards beginning in Fall 2012.

These programs feature hands-on experiences that are immediately applicable in the classroom. Many of the students earn a state certificate or credential and a master's degree simultaneously. The Reading and Literacy programs are dedicated to excellence in the preparation of teachers through on-going professional development in current, researched-based curriculum and assessment, bilingual education, reading, writing, and language arts education including critical and new literacies.

Candidates are advised throughout the program to ensure that the course sequence is appropriate for meeting individual student needs. Program planners help guide candidates to the specific coursework requirements for each credential pathway. Candidates participate in periodic advising sessions throughout the reading and language graduate programs. Some candidates expressed the desire to have a more "sequenced" program but understand that with limited class offerings this might not be possible. Candidates report that faculty provided them with numerous sequence scenarios, but the sequences provided did not seem as developmental in their ability to build upon each other. Candidates felt appreciative that faculty were accessible and quick to respond to any concerns.

Changes to the program are ongoing based on new program standards; faculty feel prepared to meet the challenge and are in a continuous improvement process.

Course of Study

Because the program holds that relevant, current and researched-based literacy curriculum and assessment must be practiced in the field with students; each course requires fieldwork. According to the candidates, about half of them have teaching positions where they conduct their fieldwork. Candidates without teaching positions “adopt” a school for their fieldwork.

The instructional approaches and methods are consistent with a balanced, comprehensive program of reading and literacy instruction. Reading faculty consist of faculty from multiple subject and single subject credential programs and practicing teachers current in reading research and instruction. The supervised clinical fieldwork is conducted during the *Summer Reading and Writing Academy*.

The Certificate and Credential programs have a sequenced set of coursework. The reading and language concentration is designed to prepare teachers for Pre-K to Community College instruction and as professionals for specialized teaching of reading, language arts, curriculum and instructional leadership in the field of language and literacy. The program has an emphasis in bilingual learning and teaching theoretically sound literacy to all learners. Required course work focuses on the nature of literacy development and the improvement of classroom curriculum including methods that emphasize the relationship of reading to other literacy and concept learning. A Masters’ degree in Reading and Language is seen as valuable to all content area teachers as well as Pre-K to Community College levels. Employers appreciate the knowledge of their faculty that have reading certificates and/or credentials and find them to be leaders at their school sites. Many have taken on the role of literacy coaches at program improvement schools.

The Reading Certificate prepares individuals to take a leadership role at the school site and emphasizes work with students who experience difficulties with reading. Reading teachers assist and support other classroom teachers, assess student progress, and monitor student achievement while providing instruction and intervention. They also play a consultative role in materials and program selection at the district and may take leadership responsibility within the more limited realm of the school site. The Reading Certificate is the first tier of the program continuum preparing teachers for services to students and teachers in the area of reading and language arts. Teachers completing the Reading Certificate are encouraged to continue to earn the Reading and Language Arts Credential.

The Reading and Language Arts Credential is the second tier of a two-level state license in the area of reading and language arts. This program prepares individuals to work with students in various settings and to perform multiple roles at the district or school level, including assisting and supporting classroom teachers in appropriate assessment and instruction of reading and writing for all students across all grade levels.

The *Summer Reading and Writing Academy* is the opportunity for candidates to work on the variety of levels needed for these programs. It involves a three week summer school for second through ninth grade students. First year program candidates are the teachers that work directly with the students. Completers reported that within the three week span their literacy teaching skills increased greatly. Second year program candidates act as the coaches and work on their roles as working with adult learners. They too report the power in this model. Overall,

completers and faculty could not be more proud of this program and its success. Candidates were quite disappointed that it was cancelled last summer, but look forward to this summer's experience.

Candidates believe that the coursework provides many opportunities for them to collaborate with each other and become teacher researchers. They believe it is the best professional development they have had. They see a link between what they are learning to increased student achievement in their classrooms.

Candidate Competence

The Academy includes on-going guidance, assistance, and feedback by the professor and Academy Director to the Reading and Language Arts Credential candidates to ensure that candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills of an expert Reading and Literacy teacher.

The program hosts reading advisory meetings once or twice a year to hear from the program completers, service area teachers and reading professionals, as well as administrators on the success of the certificate and credential programs in the preparation of reading leaders and teachers.

The department chair and faculty are working on an assessment matrix that will match new program standards and multiple measures to assess the competence of candidates. They plan to identify key assessments at each level of the program, develop rubrics, and a systematic approach to analyzing data and using it to inform their program improvements.

Findings on Standards

The Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Credential Programs are in the process of transitioning to new standards. At this time, after review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervisors, it appears that the Program Design, Course of Study and Assessment of Candidate Competency are aligned with the adopted standards and that the program is meeting standards thus far. The program will be submitting a program document for a Program Assessment review within a year of transitioning to the new standards. A standard by standard review of the new program document will be conducted to assure that the program design meets the new standards.

Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Program with Internship Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Program with Internship Added Authorization, Autism Spectrum Disorder

Program Design

The Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Programs at Sonoma State University (SSU) are offered in Mild/Moderate Disabilities (M/M) and in Moderate/Severe Disabilities (M/S) and each includes an intern program. The 45-47 unit-based Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Programs may be completed in one academic year of full-time study by candidates with prior credentials or three semesters for candidates who are pursuing the traditional student teaching model.

These programs, extensively redesigned to meet revised Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) standards (2008) for a Preliminary Education Specialist Credential, began implementation

in Fall 2010. The programs have been redesigned to reflect elements of effective teacher preparation programs that include the following.

- A cohort model of program delivery, enhancing the development of a community of learners and progression through the program in a specific sequence defined in phases.
- An emphasis on clinical practice, with specific fieldwork experiences required in each phase of the program providing varied experiences in serving students with disabilities and building in intensity and duration.
- General education reading classes in both elementary and secondary education to increase literacy preparation across all age groups and preparation for the RICA.
- Increased focus on how to use educational and assistive technology.
- Development of a “teaching event” that reflects the TPA/PACT exit survey required in general education credential programs.

Candidates complete an established program course sequence and related field experiences. Program requirements include a 23-unit core, specialization courses differentiated for mild/moderate (7 units on academic performance and math) and moderate severe (9 units on teaching strategies for students with M/S disabilities and communication development), 11 units of fieldwork spread across the program (early field experience, participant/observation fieldwork), and student teaching aligned with a 4-unit seminar (teaching event or intern). Given the common course requirements in both specializations of M/M and M/S, many candidates have completed both education specialist programs, expanding their expertise in special education and opportunities for employment. The program is also designed to accommodate candidates who have a general education credential or interns who are learning on-the-job.

In addition to the Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Programs, SSU began offering an 8-unit added authorization in Autism Spectrum Disorder in Fall 2011. The ASD authorization, approved by CTC, is designed to address the required standards with three courses: Educating Students with Autism Spectrum Disorders (3 units), Autism Spectrum Disorders: Seminar and Fieldwork (2 units) and Positive Behavior Support for Students with Disabilities (3 units).

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates progress through a rigorous program of study, as evidenced by curriculum materials and fieldwork requirements. The redesigned credential program has three well-defined phases. In Phase 1, candidates develop foundational knowledge and skills and complete an early field placement that requires 60 hours of observation and participation in three distinct special education settings. In Phase 2, candidates explore core special education curriculum in three areas: 1) case management and transition planning, 2) assessment of students with disabilities, and 3) positive behavior supports. In addition, candidates complete the first of two specialized credential-specific coursework in their area of emphasis. The field component focuses on application of course content including activities that include Assessment Case Study and Behavior Change Project in a supervised setting. Finally, Phase 3 is the culminating semester for traditional candidates. In addition to their one academic class, candidates participate in the *Teaching Event Seminar*, as well as complete a 12-week student teaching practicum. The

associated seminar is centered on a critical reflection of the teaching and learning process captured in the Teaching Event task.

A strong advisement component facilitates successful progression through the program. Candidates attend a program orientation where faculty members review the three phases of the program. To address the diverse advisement needs of candidates (e.g., interns, candidates with a general education credential, and paraprofessionals), ongoing and exit advisement occurs either in small groups during courses or on an individual basis. As substantiated by interviews with faculty, candidates and graduates, this process has enhanced program advisement and fosters close relationships between faculty and candidates. Graduates reported, “advisement was very good, beginning with an orientation with actual professors...a nice package of information the 1st day...small groups with information and advisement each semester...we love our checklists!” Moreover, faculty were reported as “available and responsive” for personal and academic support.

Candidates and graduates praised faculty for their expertise in teaching. As one graduate indicated, “faculty are recent teachers who infuse lessons with personal stories and provide hands-on experiences”. Another said, “we were so thankful for the research based practices and the theoretical foundation” that seems lacking from other preparation programs.

Candidates and graduates also commended the focus on fieldwork. As reported by one graduate, “from the beginning we are in classrooms and this provides a whole new perspective... we had a focus student in every single class as part of an assignment...classes and fieldwork supported each other”. Cooperating teachers praised the newly designed program, with candidates beginning fieldwork part time in one semester and continuing in the same placement for student teaching, already knowing the students and familiar with the classroom procedures and activities. They also indicated that some student teachers were beginning their assignments on the first day of school, another important program revision.

Overall, interviews with candidates, graduates and mentors indicated “great training” with strengths in instructional strategies, behavior management, and hands-on assignments. Candidates also talked about faculty who provided instructional technology that was “seamlessly infused in lessons”. Contributing to a technology emphasis is a new faculty member with expertise in assistive technology. A consistent suggestion from administrators, mentors and graduates was working with paraprofessionals, also identified in the biennial report in the SSU interview as a preparation need.

In summary, candidates express a great deal of appreciation for the faculty members teaching in the program. They indicate that they feel supported by the members of the faculty who are responsive to their needs. In addition, they view faculty members as experts in the field. Faculty have formed close relationships with district personnel who respect and appreciate their service to the community and the quality of their candidates.

Assessment of Candidates

Assessment of candidates is ongoing and used to inform program practices. Multiple assessment measures are conducted throughout the program to determine a candidate’s successful completion of the program expectations with an emphasis on formative assessment and reflection. A mid-program portfolio assessment is being piloted with a rubric using a 3-point

rating scale to examine key assignments. Final program assessments include an evaluation of student teaching or the internship and a portfolio review (the old program) or teaching event (the new program) also using a 3-point rating scale. Candidates, University Field Supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers collaboratively complete the student teaching/internship evaluations. Each candidate must meet the standard in the overall evaluation of each of these assessments to be recommended for the credential.

It was evident by the biennial report and faculty interviews that evaluation data and consultation with the community was informing program practices, especially in the design of the new preliminary credential program. Also evident were the variety of assessment measures implemented throughout the program to evaluate candidate competency. However, faculty discussed some concern with the reliability of measures. For example, the biennial report states a lack of consistency in grades on assessments that are scored by different instructors in different course sections. Faculty members have agreed to work on better inter-rater reliability checks or clearer rubrics for such assignments. Faculty are also working on reliability for the new Teaching Event. Given this need, the biennial report recommends that faculty meet to refine and calibrate rubrics to achieve more reliable assessment of candidates by different faculty members. These activities will continue to enhance program assessment and inform program practices.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met. All candidates in the previous Level I programs have completed the required coursework and fieldwork. The Preliminary Education Specialist M/M, M/S programs have fully transitioned this academic year. From the evidence reviewed at the site visit from both the previous Level I and new Preliminary Education Specialist programs at this time, it appears the Program Design, Course of Study and Assessment of Candidate Competency are aligned with the adopted standards and that the program is meeting standards thus far. At this time, this is a preliminary finding. The program document has been completed and received at the Commission; the document will be scheduled for a Program Assessment review. A standard by standard review of the new program document will be conducted to assure that the program design meets the new standards.

Adapted Physical Education

Program Design

The Adapted Physical Education (APE) Credential Program is housed in the School of Science and Technology, primarily in the Department of Kinesiology, and prepares approximately 5-10 candidates per year. Most APE students are Single Subject Physical Education candidates, who complete both programs concurrently. There are also some Multiple Subject candidates who complete the program concurrently. Student teaching in Adapted Physical Education takes place under the auspices of the School of Education, in conjunction with student teachers completing either a Single Subject PE credential or a Multiple Subjects credential. A third group are candidates who already have a credential in Physical Education or Multiple Subjects; they can pursue APE through a subject matter program in APE and complete 60 hours of field experience instead of student teaching. For these students, APE coursework may be completed over two or

more semesters, depending on previous college work and the number of courses taken each semester.

The APE program is transitioning to an added authorization to meet revised Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) standards approved on 7/27/2011 with SSU submitting a revised APE program to meet the new standards in the coming year. Much of the coursework of this well-established and respected 26-unit program already meets the four new APE standards and will continue to be offered. Changes in the program have included eliminating an elective, incorporating two new special education courses, and adopting the PACT which is required as a culminating performance assessment in the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs. With the added authorization, an APE option will also be available for Education Specialist credential candidates.

The APE coordinator is a tenured Full Professor in the Department of Kinesiology. She teaches three of the lecture classes and the fieldwork course in the APE subject matter program and APE student teaching. Active in the profession and community, she communicates regularly with APE and General PE teachers throughout the SSU service area and participates across the state in professional organizations and state and national conferences. A tenure-track faculty member with a Ph.D. in Adapted Physical Education joined the Kinesiology Department in the fall of 2009. She teaches one of the APE subject matter courses and serves as the Physical Education Concentration Coordinator. As substantiated by interviews, both faculty members are highly competent and respected by colleagues, students, and community partners for their commitment and hands-on approach to preparing highly qualified APE candidates.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates in APE complete a program course sequence with related field experiences infused throughout the program. As consistently reported in interviews of candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers, the program provides highly engaging, participatory coursework and systematic structured fieldwork with exposure to a variety of teaching styles, service delivery models, activities, teaching practices, and schools and agencies.

Field experiences begin in the first course of the program, KIN 325, in which 18 hours are required. Most students complete these hours in an exemplary on-campus 8-week Saturday Sidekicks program where SSU students are paired with one child at each of two sessions. In KIN 426, a number of field experiences are required such as observing an assessment, an IEP meeting, and two community recreation/leisure or sport activities; attending a professional conference; and informal observations on their case study participant and implement programming. In KIN 427, students complete 14 field hours in which they create a behavior plan and a final project. EDSP 433 requires 10 hours of field experiences in a special education program for secondary students. In KIN 430C students complete 60 hours of fieldwork across a range of ages and severity of disabilities, kinds of settings, and activities, and types of school placements. Finally, during the student teaching experience, students observe, assist, and teach in a variety of settings.

Feedback from APE candidates and former candidates identify hands-on experiences as being one of the most significant learning experiences. Saturday Sidekicks, Bike Camp, and working with APE teachers and recreation specialists are regularly highlighted. Through these exemplary experiences, students hone their skills in a variety of APE settings and learn from effective APE providers.

During the final phase in the credential program, student teaching hours are divided between general education and APE. Students have two mentor teachers, one a general PE teacher and one an adapted physical educator. Individuals who supervise APE student teachers have graduated from colleges and universities with certified programs in APE and hold current teaching certifications authorizing the teaching of APE in California. As reported by a graduate and itinerant APE teacher who mentors APE students, student teaching requirements are very clear with an explicit checklist provided for observations. An APE graduate indicated that faculty were supportive and flexible; he appreciated fieldwork experiences and the opportunity to student teach in his teaching position as a PE teacher. Finally, faculty have created strong relationships with students that continue once they graduate.

Students and graduates express appreciation for their program of study with its emphasis on a variety of structured fieldwork experiences closely linked with coursework. They recognize the high caliber of faculty members, value their support and commitment to the program, and their availability in responding to their needs. Faculty have formed close relationships with district personnel who respect and appreciate their service to the community and the high quality of their candidates.

Assessment of Candidates

Multiple assessment measures are conducted throughout the program to determine a candidate's successful completion of program competencies. Coursework assessments include performance on tests and quizzes, written assignments and presentations, and observations of hands-on work with children with disabilities by the Program Coordinator and by a variety of Field Supervisors. During student teaching on-going assessments of performance are completed by the APE Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor.

Upon completion of the APE program, students submit a portfolio that assesses their competency in meeting the CTC APE standards. The Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor then complete a final assessment based on this portfolio and their observations of the candidate during the student teaching experience.

Faculty have thoughtfully analyzed evaluation data and made recommendations for program improvement. For example, in the Biennial Report they indicate that there's a need for continued development of candidate competencies particularly in assessment, curriculum development, and behavior management, and recommend that "a greater emphasis on these areas in fieldwork and student teaching is warranted". Recognizing a need to enhance the assessment of candidates, they propose that with the transition of APE to an Added Authorization, they have the opportunity to design new tools for more systematic assessment of candidate competencies and program effectiveness, as well as to refine current tools. This ongoing assessment continues to enhance the high quality APE program and inform program practices.

Findings on standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program

Program Design

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC-I) program at Sonoma State University is a 27-unit cohort-based program that extends over two semesters, and includes a well-planned sequence of courses, assignments, and fieldwork leading to the credential. Candidates can also choose to complete the Masters in Education, which requires additional coursework.

Recent graduates and candidates are enthusiastic about the cohort structure, appreciating the support and collaboration they experienced throughout their year of intense work. They form strong ties with fellow students as they jointly explore important issues and learn together, and it is clear that these networks extend beyond their credential completion. The cohorts are formed of candidates from a range of educational settings; candidates found that they learned a great deal from each other and grew to rely on each other for advice and ideas.

Candidates and recent graduates describe the program as being about educational leadership, not simply about becoming a principal. This distinction is important, they felt, because they found that the program prepared them for many kinds of leadership roles in schools, districts, and county offices of education. They felt well-prepared to take on school and teacher leadership, to think differently about their roles, and to have an impact on their educational settings. This was echoed by the principals who are their Site Supervisors.

Initially, the program was designed to be completed in one year and candidates were only admitted annually during the fall term. However, interns can now also be admitted in Spring, and some students elect to extend their participation in the program beyond one year. In describing their program design, the department chair and program faculty indicated that this change in enrollment patterns has created challenges in how data is accurately gathered and aggregated. However, they also described plans for developing better data collection tools that would provide the information necessary to learn about all aspects of the program.

The Administrative Intern Program allows individuals who are hired as administrators in their respective districts to work under an Intern Credential and take courses in the PASC-I program, including supervision, to support their role as an administrator. Interns may be admitted in both Fall and Spring semesters.

Candidates and completers both commented that the design of the program was exceptional and well-planned, and met their expectations as they progressed through the program. In particular, they commented that the course sequence “makes sense,” following a clear plan that links topics, theories, and practical experiences from course to course, across both semesters.

As stated by faculty, candidates, completers, mentors and employers, the PASC I program should be commended for the success of creating professional and self reflective educational leaders. Principals who serve as site supervisors described the program as having a clear outcome of developing reflective practitioners who seek feedback, are willing to adapt their practice, and who are very well-prepared to take on leadership roles in their schools.

Candidates complete a series of assignments that give them multiple opportunities to develop these reflective qualities. The Praxis Journal, course discussions, the “What Is” paper, and the capstone fieldwork project with the final portfolio all engage candidates in real-school activities and processes in which they must link theory to their daily practice.

In addition, a critical component of the PASC I program is the Mid Program Assessment of the candidates. Interviews with the candidates, completers, and faculty show that the inclusion of this assignment gives a clear indication of the progress of the candidates, and also guides discussions and changes in the PASC I program and curriculum. The PASC I program should be commended for creating the Mid Program Assessment that is so effective in gathering reflective data that other School of Education programs are adopting this assessment tool for their programs.

Course of Study

The PASC I program consists of 27 units across two semesters, as follows:

- EDEL 580A Educational Leadership and School Management (3 units)
- EDEL 580B Educational Leadership and School Management (3 units)
- EDEL 581 Management of Educational Personnel: Policies and Procedures (3 units)
- EDEL 582 Educational Policy and Politics (3 units)
- EDEL 583 School Law (3 units)
- EDEL 588 Educational Curriculum, Instruction, and Program Assessment (3 units)
- EDEL 589 Leadership with Diverse Populations (3 units)
- EDEL 587A Beginning Field Experience in Administration (3 units)
- EDEL 587B Advanced Field Experience in Administration (3 units)

The PASC I program’s fieldwork component is designed to provide hands-on administrative experiences in which theory learned in coursework is applied in a practical setting. Therefore, coursework content in the PASC I program is closely linked to fieldwork. Fieldwork runs concurrently with coursework; each candidate must complete two semesters of fieldwork. Fieldwork activities begin early in the program and continue through to the culminating experience at the end. In most cases, candidates perform their fieldwork in the district or school setting in which they work. Interviews with candidates confirmed that these types of placements are successful, especially when the site supervisors are supportive leader/coaches. Assessments and key assignments are filed by each candidate in her/his Electronic Portfolio.

University field supervisors provide a minimum of three site visits each semester to each candidate, and also hold two on campus cohort meetings. Candidates and recent graduates clearly understood the role of the faculty supervisor, who is also the instructor of their fieldwork course.

The candidates and completers both mentioned that they received adequate preparation as they moved through the program. Faculty also stated that as they assess the progress of the candidates, they reflect on how to change the curriculum to best meet the needs of the candidates and other stakeholders outside the university. An example given by candidates was that faculty invited feedback on the writing assignments, and made significant changes to the assignments based on candidates’ suggestions.

Comments made by faculty, candidates and completers indicated that the curriculum, particularly in dealing with diverse cultures and communities, was very demanding and moved them out of their comfort zone. Candidates appreciate the program requirements that got them out into the community in practical ways, and that allowed them to be regarded as educational leaders.

Candidates evaluate the program and their instructors at the end of each class. Faculty members also stated that at the end of each year, they reflect on the successes and problem areas that appear within the coverage of the curriculum and make adjustments before the next session.

Candidate Competence

The PASC-I program conducts multiple assessments throughout the program to determine candidates' successful completion of the program standards. Two key assessments are the Mid-Point Assessment and the Final Assessment/Capstone Review. The elements included in these assessments are the critical course assignments, progress on fieldwork activities, and final/summative candidate activities. Importantly, all program assessments are tied to the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL).

As a part of the Mid-Point Candidate Assessment, the program has identified several critical assignments within program classes that, when looked at collectively, serve as important components to help faculty assess each candidate's progress mid-way through the program. The elements of the mid-point assessment vary based upon the Fall courses offered but could include critical assignments such as the "What Is Paper" (EDEL 580A), "Essay on Policy and Politics" (EDEL 582), "Letter of Reprimand" (EDEL 581) as well as a review of the candidate's self-assessment on the CPSEL standards and related "Action Plan" drawn from their fieldwork activities (EDEL 587A). A rubric for evaluation has been developed for each critical assignment to measure the candidate's level of competency along the following scale: exceptional (4), above average (3), average (2) or low (1). If a candidate does not meet the expectation in any key activity, it must be revised until the candidate meets the anticipated standard or objective.

Each candidate is also assessed at the end of the program as a part of the final candidate assessment system or Capstone Review. The Capstone Review is comprised of three elements including: (a) an Electronic Portfolio of program artifacts (b) a Culminating Project, and (c) a review of their Leadership Competencies that are focused on the CPSEL. In developing their Portfolio, candidates are expected to include previously scored "critical assignments" from their second semester courses such as the Personal Theory of Leadership paper and Curriculum Evaluation project. The final assessments are evaluated on the four-point scale explained above.

In interviews with program completers and candidates, the overall comment was that they were confident that the fieldwork embedded within the PASC I curriculum gave them adequate experience as they have moved into their new roles as educational leaders.

University supervisors, mentors, and faculty are in continual communication regarding the progress of the candidates' experience and provide any support needed when warranted.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Professional Administrative Services Credential Program**Program Design**

The current program design for the Professional Administrative Services Credential Program (PASC II) at Sonoma State University involves an effective program that prepares current on-site educational administrators with the necessary experiences and completion of four to six key assessments of the candidate's professional growth. This format leads to an extensive self assessment and Individualized Induction Plan for the professional to follow and complete for the requirements for Professional Clear Credential.

Based on interviews with program instructors, university supervisors and mentors, there appears to be a clear channel of communication between the university and its field supervisors on the completion of the key assessments and candidate competency. With the re-formatting of the assessment data collection system over the last three years, aggregate data needed to determine the program effectiveness is adequate and the methodology is evolving. The department leadership and staff agree that the program needs to continue collecting data for a longer period of time and use other types of data to show potential growth and areas of improvement. The candidates commented that they find the assignments that relate to the six key assessments very valuable, and their knowledge is adequate to the requirements of completing those assessments. University supervisors and credential staff confirmed that the candidates feel very supported throughout the program and assessments. This is clearly a strength of this program.

Enrollment in PASC II is currently very low. Interviews with faculty, employers and program completers explored the issue of this drop in enrollment. They suggest that it is due to the AB 430 credentialing exam, which may be a preferred alternative, and the current state education funding and impact on administrative positions available statewide. PASC II staff stated that as the state moves toward eliminating the AB 430 program, a plan needs to be in place that would respond to the potential increase in enrollments. Meanwhile, the PASC II program now is offered biennially and was last offered in the 2010-2011 academic year.

The PASC Community Advisory Committee continues to meet during the year to provide input and guidance to the department. Interviews with university supervisors, mentors, employers and candidates confirmed that surveys are conducted each year to provide valuable feedback to the credential program. Most candidates felt that their input was considered and valued by the credential program.

Course of Study

The PASC II consists of six courses wrapped around the Individualized Induction Plan, six key assessments within the six courses, and collaborative action research. The candidates and completers that were interviewed found that the assignments/projects were meaningful and had

an impact on how they perceived their leadership role on their school campus. The Initial Competency Self Assessment serves as the focal point for the work to be completed in PASC II. The candidates re-assess themselves with the Final Competency Assessment, or the Capstone activity, with specific evidence related to their self assessment on each standard. The University supervisor and mentor review the self evaluation, and final certification is completed by the university supervisor. During interviews with the university supervisors, mentors and candidates, all groups agreed that the self assessment was worthwhile and valuable.

Interviews with the mentors and employers showed that the support system for PASC II candidates is very effective and supportive. The inclusion of the six key assessments has led to significant changes in program improvement, such as better use of technology in communicating results of assessments and in presenting their assignments and portfolios.

Candidate Competence

In the beginning of the accreditation process, PASC II program did not have adequate methods of assessment or scoring rubrics that could be used to give feedback and drive program improvement. For example, they were not using four key assessments required for PASC II candidate competence. The department chair explained that the PASC II program now has in place sufficient assessment methods with the Mid Point Assessment and Capstone assessment and they should be commended that most candidates have either met or exceeded the performance standards. The PASC II faculty should also be commended for a model of assessment that is being adopted by other credential programs.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling

Program Design

The School Counseling Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) Credential is offered in the Department of Counseling, which is part of the School of Social Sciences at Sonoma State University. The credential is granted as part of a 60-unit Masters in Counseling degree. There is also an option for those with existing Masters in Counseling degrees to enter the “credential only” track to qualify for the PPS credential. There are two students currently in the “credential only” track. Although the program also has an internship program, there are no current candidates.

The 60-unit graduate program in counseling offers two professional training options: Option I prepares students for Community Counseling: Marriage and Family Therapist (MFT) licensure, and Option II prepares students for the School Counseling: Pupil Personnel Services Credential (PPSC). The PPSC preparation program is coordinated by a member of the PPSC program faculty, in close collaboration with other Counseling Department faculty; program decisions and curricular revisions are driven by the PPSC program faculty in conjunction with Counseling Department faculty. Departmental oversight rests with the Department Chair. The PPSC program

coordinator also consults with the Deans of the School of Social Sciences and the School of Education as needed. The Counseling Department faculty meets every other week for two hours, with additional program meetings as needed. The Department also holds two annual day-long retreats. The Unit ensures that candidate needs are resolved promptly through established regular formal and informal communication meetings. Beginning with the first semester, the program relies heavily on interpersonal skill training and field experience and culminates with an intensive supervised internship in some aspect of counseling, permitting the integration of theory, research, and practical application during the second year. Candidates and Completers indicated that the faculty meets regularly with them to ensure that they are progressing in their understanding of the requirements of the counseling program. The Department is prepared to assist students in obtaining field placements relevant to their projected professional goals. The faculty considers the current skills of the candidates to arrange field placements as well as the personalities of the candidates and the district field supervisor. It is the goal of the university supervisors to ensure that there is a good match between the candidates, the field supervisors, and the school sites in order to produce maximum learning opportunities for the candidates. For the school counseling program, candidates must have field placements at two of the three K-12 levels: elementary school, middle school or high school. The guidelines for fieldwork placements are outlined in the Fieldwork Handbook; candidates and site based fieldwork supervisors indicated that the guidelines were clearly written. In interviews, candidates, completers, and field supervisors indicated that if there were questions, candidates were able to discuss this with the faculty supervisors for clarification via email, phone calls or in person.

In 2007, the process of revising the curriculum began following a program review conducted by various accrediting agencies (CTC, NCATE, and CACREP). The revision aimed to integrate the ASCA National Model, as well as feedback received through alumni and supervisor surveys. Field Supervisors who were completers of the program prior to 2007 stated that these revisions, such as a course on law and ethics and crisis interventions, have resulted in the program content to be more closely aligned with contemporary school counseling standards, ideals, and practice.

The Department of the School Counseling program provides substantial opportunities for participation of diverse community members, including professional practitioners, as members of its Advisory Board. There are approximately 20 members on the Advisory Board representing district school counselors, teachers, administrators, university faculty, program students, and district parents, among others.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Clear admissions requirements for the Department of Counseling and the PPSC program were found in the University Catalog, Department website, and materials distributed at monthly informational meetings with candidates. Admissions decisions are based on review of applicant's written application (including personal narrative, transcripts and letters of reference), as well as both individual and group interviews.

The course of study follows a clear sequence of skills training, with intensive review and gate keeping for the sequence of Pre-Practicum (which is a functional and theoretical course), Practicum, and fieldwork where they apply the skills they have learned. Procedures for advancement and retention are outlined in the Student Handbook and website and candidates indicated that the procedures were very clear to them.

The program faculty conducts a developmental, systematic assessment of each student's progress throughout the program, including consideration of the student's academic performance, personal and professional development. The faculty systematically evaluates students' progress through the program using a pre-determined assessment sequence. The program conducts comprehensive candidate reviews at each juncture of a delineated training sequence, which includes Pre-Practicum, Practicum, and 2 semesters of Supervised Field Experience. For the Pre-Practicum and Practicum students, this involves formal evaluation by their faculty supervisor. Evaluation forms are completed by faculty supervisors at the end of the Pre-Practicum and Practicum courses and filed in the student's department file. In addition, comprehensive reviews of candidates' competencies occur on a faculty-wide basis at regular intervals. Each first-year student is notified that they will be reviewed by the department twice in Pre-Practicum (mid- and end of semester) and again in Practicum (again, mid- and end of semester).

All candidate reviews occur during regularly scheduled department meetings. There are weekly conversations between the faculty concerning the candidates and if there are any apparent candidate needs, the faculty addresses those needs with the candidates usually before the candidates talk with the faculty. Candidates indicated that they appreciated this practice of the faculty; that it gave them a sense of being cared for in order for them to be successful in their degree studies.

The reviews for each student are led by the faculty supervisor for Pre- Practicum/Practicum, with input provided by all faculty members (tenure line and adjunct) working with the student. These student reviews include the students' academic performance, their developing competence in becoming effective school counselors, and an evaluation of whether their progress toward meeting department objectives needs more intensive attention. The students' *Handbook* provides them with the department learning objectives for Pre-Practicum and Practicum. In addition, the revised Student Retention Policy clearly outlines possible outcomes and remediation steps resulting from these faculty-wide reviews. Feedback from these meetings is conveyed to students through the faculty supervisor and/or faculty advisor, depending on the circumstances. The candidates expressed their appreciation of the faculty for taking the time to discuss the issues that the candidates might be facing and for offering possible solutions for the candidates to take in order to resolve the issue.

After a review of the candidates' competencies as noted above, students may be approved to enter the Field Experience phase of their training. In this phase, students complete 600 hours of field-based pre-service school counseling work. District field supervisors formally evaluate the students placed in their school twice: once at the end of fall semester and again at the conclusion of the field experience placement. In addition, ongoing information is typically gained through periodic site visits by the pre-service school counselor, and/or faculty field supervisor, and/or by phone or email contact with the district field supervisor as needed. Throughout the field placement there is dialogue between students and the faculty supervisor. District Field Supervisors stated that the faculty supervisor visits the school site at least 2 to 4 times per semester to observe the students' professional development and emerging competence in meeting the objectives for the field placements. Students also complete several capstone projects, including a grant proposal and case study. Successful completion is required in order to complete the degree. At the end of the student's final semester, the School Counseling program coordinator conducts a final review culminating in a Certification of Completion. In preparing

the Certification of Completion, the Program Coordinator reviews each student's transcript/course work completion, CBEST completion, and verification of Field Experience requirements. This information is then sent to the School of Education's credential analyst for final review and filing of the PPSC credential. There is a strong collaborative working relationship between the credential analyst and the program coordinator to ensure that the credential requirements are fulfilled and filed.

Assessment of Candidates

For student learning outcomes, the assessment measures are largely embedded within the courses, with a sequence of formal assessments at specified program transition points (e.g., between pre-practicum and practicum, practicum and field experience, and before graduation). As indicated in previous information, the assessment of candidates is done at the mid-semester point as well as at the end of the semester. The results of the assessments determine whether the candidates have mastered the learning routines and are ready move on to the next level of training. Assessment measures for Pre-Practicum include direct observation and review of audio/videotapes of the counselor-in-training's work with clients, as well as oral and written feedback from the faculty supervisor and student self-evaluation. The faculty members review the assessment during regularly scheduled department meetings or whenever necessary. If adjunct faculty are the instructors of either of these classes, they are asked to provide written feedback and are invited to attend the meeting. These student reviews include the students' academic performance, their developing competence in becoming effective school counselors, and an evaluation of whether their progress toward meeting department objectives need more intensive attention. The students' *Handbook* provides them with the department learning objectives for Pre-Practicum, candidates indicated that the requirements are very clear. All feedback information is integrated during the comprehensive faculty meeting and determination is made regarding each student's readiness for Practicum. When concerns are noted, students are required to work with relevant faculty to create a learning plan aimed at addressing areas of concern. Candidates and completers stated that they valued the input of the faculty in support of their progress toward meeting the requirements.

As with Pre-Practicum, each first year student is reviewed twice in Practicum. Assessment measures for Practicum include direct observation and review of audio/videotapes of the counselor-in training's work with students, as well as oral and written feedback from the district field supervisor, faculty supervisors, student self-evaluation, and feedback from the classroom teachers with whom students work. At the end of the Practicum, all faculty supervisors complete a checklist that summarizes their evaluation of the students' competencies. Faculty reviews occur as outlined above in the Pre-Practicum section and when concerns are noted, students are required to work with relevant faculty to create a learning plan aimed at addressing areas of concern. A determination is made by faculty regarding each student's readiness to move on to field experience. Assessment results and implications for program improvement are regularly discussed at department meetings and at the School Counseling Advisory Board meetings.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all standards are **Met**.